

Antimicrobial dressings

Halstead, Fenella D; Rauf, Maryam; Bamford, Amy; Wearn, Christopher M; Bishop, Jonathan R B; Burt, Rebecca; Fraise, Adam P; Moiemmen, Naiem S; Oppenheim, Beryl A; Webber, Mark A

DOI:

[10.1016/j.burns.2015.06.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2015.06.005)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Halstead, FD, Rauf, M, Bamford, A, Wearn, CM, Bishop, JRB, Burt, R, Fraise, AP, Moiemmen, NS, Oppenheim, BA & Webber, MA 2015, 'Antimicrobial dressings: Comparison of the ability of a panel of dressings to prevent biofilm formation by key burn wound pathogens', *Burns*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 1683–1694.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burns.2015.06.005>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Validated Feb 2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

1 **Antimicrobial dressings: Comparison of the ability of a panel of dressings to prevent biofilm**
2 **formation by key burn wound pathogens**

3 Fenella D. Halstead^{a,b,c}, Maryam Rauf^{a,b,c}, ~~Naiem S. Moiem~~^{a,d,e}, Amy Bamford^{a,ed}, Christopher M
4 Wearn^{a,ed}, Jonathan R B Bishop^b, Rebecca Burt^{a,b,c}, Adam P. Fraise^a, Naiem S. Moiem^{a,d,e}, Beryl A
5 Oppenheim^{a,b}, Mark A Webber^{b,c*}

6
7 ^a Queen Elizabeth Hospital, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

8 ^b NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Centre, Queen Elizabeth Hospital,
9 Birmingham, UK

10 ^c Institute of Microbiology and Infection, School of Biosciences, College of Medical and Dental
11 Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT, UK

12 ~~^d Birmingham Children's Hospital, Birmingham, UK~~

13 ^{ed} The Healing Foundation Burns Research Centre, Birmingham, UK

14 ^e Birmingham Children's Hospital, Birmingham, UK

15
16 * Corresponding author. Institute of Microbiology and Infection, School of Immunity and Infection,
17 College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT,
18 UK. Tel: +44-121-414-2859; Fax: +44-121-414-6819; E-mail: m.a.webber@bham.ac.uk

19
20 **FDH:** fenella.halstead@uhb.nhs.uk

21 **MR:** maryamrauf1@yahoo.co.uk

22 ~~**NSM:** naiem.moimen@uhb.nhs.uk~~

23 **AB:** amy.bamford@uhb.nhs.uk

24 **CMW:** Christopher.wearn@uhb.nhs.uk

25 **JRBB:** j.bishop.1@bham.ac.uk

26 **RB:** rebecca.burt@uhb.nhs.uk

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm,
Hanging: 0.25 cm

27 **APF:** adam.fraise@uhb.nhs.uk

28 | **NSM:** naiem.moiemen@uhb.nhs.uk

29 **BAO:** beryl.oppenheim@uhb.nhs.uk

30 **MAW:** m.a.webber@bham.ac.uk

31 |

32 ABSTRACT

33 Antimicrobial medicated dressings (AMD) are often used to reduce bacterial infection of burns and
34 other wounds. However, ~~since AMD are medical devices~~, there is limited literature regarding
35 comparative efficacies to inform effective clinical decision making.

36 Objectives

37 Following on from a previous study where we demonstrated good antibiofilm properties of acetic
38 acid (AA), we assessed and compared the *in vitro* anti-biofilm activity of a range of AMDs and non-
39 AMDs to AA.

40 Methods

41 Laboratory experiments ~~were used to determine~~determined the ability of a range of eleven
42 commercial AMD, two nAMD, and AA, to prevent the formation of biofilms of a panel of four isolates
43 of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter baumannii*.

44 Results

45 There is a large variation in ability of different dressings to inhibit biofilm formation, seen ~~both~~
46 ~~with~~between dressings that contain the same, and those that contain ~~a variety of~~ other
47 antimicrobial agents. The best performing AMD were Mepilex® Ag and Acticoat. AA consistently
48 prevented biofilm formation.

49 Conclusions

50 ~~Vast~~Large variation exists in the ability of AMD to prevent biofilm formation and colonisation of
51 wounds. A standardised *in vitro* methodology should be developed for external parties to examine
52 and compare the efficacies of commercially available AMDs, along with robust clinical randomised

53 controlled trials. This is essential for informed clinical decision-making and optimal patient

54 management.

55 **Keywords:** Antimicrobial, dressings, wounds, burns, biofilms.

56 1 INTRODUCTION¹

57 Infection is a significant concern in patients who survive an initial burn insult. This complication of
58 burn recovery impacts on morbidity, mortality and healthcare costs [1], and in some centres has
59 been estimated to account for over 75% of the mortality [2].

60 Burns patients are especially susceptible to infection owing to the injury removing the protective
61 barrier provided by the skin, combined with general immunosuppression, the presence of
62 endogenous microflora, prolonged hospital stays, and invasive diagnostic and therapeutic
63 procedures [3]. Consequently despite careful treatment and infection control practices, burn
64 wounds are readily colonised with a range of pathogenic micro-organisms, significantly delaying
65 wound healing, and increasing risks of systemic infection, and graft failure [4].

66 The most frequently implicated bacteria are *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Acinetobacter baumannii*,
67 *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, and
68 *Enterobacter* spp [5, 6]. Of these, *P. aeruginosa* and *A. baumannii* are most prevalent [7], with
69 Lawrence [8] finding *P. aeruginosa* in one-third of burn wounds, and in 59% of those patients with
70 extensive burns. Yali *et al* [9] took clinical samples from burns patients in burn intensive care units
71 (ICU) and common burn wards and identified the organisms causing infection. 1621 pathogens were
72 isolated from 2395 clinical samples of the burn ICU, and of these 74.2% were Gram-negative. *A.*
73 *baumannii* was the most prevalent representing 34.4% of all pathogens present in this setting.
74 Additionally, there is also concern that patients may acquire bacteria with resistance to multiple
75 systemic antimicrobials, such as the carbapenem resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* (CRE), for which there
76 are very limited treatment options.

77 Colonisation of burn wounds typically occurs as biofilms (communities of bacteria), which are harder
78 to treat and eradicate owing to reduced rates of metabolism and protection against antimicrobial

¹ AMD: antimicrobial dressing; nAMD: non-antimicrobial dressing; AA: acetic acid; ICU: intensive care unit; AM: antimicrobial; RCTs: randomised controlled trials; MH: muller-hinton; CV: crystal violet.

agents and the immune response) afforded by the polysaccharide matrix [10]. Consequently the presence of biofilms is associated with persistence of colonisation and increased risk of systemic infection [1]. Hence, general principles of wound management include appropriate systemic care (e.g. in terms of pain control, nutrition and control of serum glucose levels in those with diabetes mellitus), combined with local wound care (especially in terms of preventing colonisation). For burn wounds, the standard of care worldwide is early excision of necrotic tissues followed by covering the wound with a medical dressing. Prevention and treatment of bacterial colonisation are key parts of wound care [11].

There is a ~~vast~~large array of dressings and a range of factors that govern the choice of dressing that is most appropriate for wound management (e.g. type of wound, stage of healing process, and volume of exudate). However, for burns and other wounds where infection is a high risk, antimicrobial dressings (AMD) may be used. Typically the antimicrobial agent (AM) is contained within a commercially marketed wound dressing, which can be used both prophylactically (to prevent colonisation of the wound and subsequent biofilm formation), and in the treatment of established infection. Systemic administration of antimicrobials is not thought to be necessary nor useful for the management of local wound infections, since the drugs i) may not penetrate well into the wounds (due to poor blood flow and the presence of dead tissue) [10], ii) would need to be used in very high doses (to treat organisms growing in sessile biofilms) [12], and iii) systemic administration has not been shown to prevent bacterial colonisation [13]. Furthermore, inappropriate use of systemic antibiotics can be associated with problems of allergy, toxicity and the development of resistance in non-target organisms.

AMD account for approximately a quarter of all dressings prescribed in primary care in England [14], and may contain a range of antimicrobial agents (e.g. silver, iodine, honey, and chlorhexidine). The use of AMD and silver-dressings (which are classed as 'advanced' dressings) has risen in recent years,

103 with £25 million spent on silver dressings in 2006/7 [10]. Indeed, one in every seven wound dressing
104 items prescribed by the NHS contain silver as an active agent [10].

Formatted: Font color: Auto

105 Silver (Ag) has been used extensively in burn wound management [15] and is a potent antimicrobial.
106 Silver-containing dressings vary in their composition and act by a combination of i) absorbing wound
107 exudates and killing the microorganisms drawn into the dressings, and/or ii) releasing active silver
108 onto the wound bed. These biologically active ions then bind to negatively charged proteins, RNA,
109 and DNA and damage bacterial cell walls, inhibit replication and reduce metabolism and growth [16].
110 Broad antimicrobial activity has been reported against Gram-positive and Gram-negative organisms
111 [17], protozoa, viruses [18], and fungi [19].

112 AMD are marketed as effective against a broad range of bacteria (growing as biofilms) over multiple
113 days, and are indicated for a variety of serious wounds (e.g. partial thickness burns, ulcers, donor
114 and graft sites, traumatic, and surgical wounds). Provided that the agent is considered to only
115 provide an ancillary action on the wound, the majority of dressings (including AMD) are classified as
116 medical devices [20]. This means there are lesser requirements in terms of robust data from
117 randomised controlled trials (RCTs) to support safety and efficacy, and literature reviews and
118 commercial company-led research are often deemed acceptable for licensing. Consequently, there is
119 little data available in peer-reviewed literature concerning their activity [11]. Unsurprisingly in
120 clinical practice, opinions on the use of silver dressings are divided, with some clinicians believing
121 that they have a role to play in preventing infection in burns patients [21, 22, 23], and other experts
122 not endorsing their use owing to a lack of evidence of effectiveness [10, 24].

123 Several systematic reviews have been performed looking at use of silver dressings for wound
124 management with the majority concluding that there is insufficient evidence to recommend using
125 silver dressings. A systematic review performed by [25] identified 14 RCTs of silver-containing
126 dressings and topical silver agents (used with dressings) for burn wounds, and despite significantly
127 better healing with silver compared to the control in one small trial, they concluded that silver-

128 containing dressings were either no better, or were worse than control dressings in preventing
129 wound infection. Indeed, a Cochrane Review from 2010 looking at topical silver products (dressings
130 and creams) identified 26 RCTs (20 of which were on burns), and concluded that there was
131 'insufficient evidence to support the use of silver containing dressings or creams, as generally they
132 did not promote wound healing or prevent wound infections' [26]. However, despite these findings,
133 clinicians are still using silver dressings perhaps owing to the extensive marketing and promotion of
134 these commercial dressings [27], and the absence of any alternatives.

135 In addition to silver, AMD may contain iodine/povidone-iodine (which rapidly penetrates
136 microorganisms, damaging proteins, nucleotides and fatty acids, leading to rapid cell death) [28],
137 honey (which is antimicrobial due to osmotic effect, a low pH and the production of hydrogen
138 peroxide [29]), or chlorhexidine; which binds to and disrupts the negatively charged bacterial cell
139 wall and affects the osmotic equilibrium of the cell [30]. Furthermore, in addition to commercial
140 AMD, ~~biocides~~other biocide-impregnated dressings may have a role to play in preventing wound
141 infection. A range of biocides have been investigated in this regard (e.g. silver nitrate, mafenide
142 acetate, povidine iodine, silver sulfadiazine and chlorhexidine), including acetic acid (CH₃COOH).

143 Acetic acid (AA), or vinegar, has been used sporadically in medicine for the past 6000 years [4], being
144 successfully implemented to treat plague, ear, chest, and urinary tract infections [31, 32, 33], and in
145 the elimination of *Bacillus pyocyaneus* (now *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*) from war wounds [7]. We
146 have used AA for a decade in our burns centre at a concentration of 2.5% to treat patients with burn
147 wounds infected or heavily colonised with *P. aeruginosa*. Here it is applied topically within dressings,
148 is well-tolerated by patients, and is observed to have good clinical outcomes. Additionally, AA is
149 currently used in a number of lesser economically developed countries (LEDCs) and other resource-
150 limited settings for burn wound management.

151 | Following a recent study on the anti-biofilm properties of AA as a topical AM agent, we sought to
152 | assess and compare the anti-biofilm properties of AA versus the AMDs currently used in our Burns
153 | Centre at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Birmingham.

154 | We aimed to compare efficacy to help guide clinical practice at our centre and others.

155

156 | 2 METHODS

157 | A series of *in vitro* experiments were conducted to determine the efficacy of the AMD in terms of
158 | their ability to prevent biofilm formation. AA (in a range of concentrations from 5% down to 0.02%)
159 | was included as a comparator following on from previous research [Halstead *et al*, unpublished]
160 | which demonstrated AA to be effective at preventing biofilm formation when used from 5% down to
161 | concentrations as low as 0.31% (w/v). Plain dressings that contained no antimicrobial agent (herein
162 | referred to as nAMD) were also included as comparators.

163 | Four organisms were tested (two *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and two *Acinetobacter baumannii*)
164 | (Table I), and comprised well-characterised control strains (PS_PA01, ACI_AYE) and clinical isolates
165 | from burns patients (ACI_721, PS_1586). All AM products (Table II) were freshly opened and were
166 | within date when used. Experiments were performed using at least two biological replicates, and at
167 | least four technical replicates of each isolate.

168

169 | 2.1 Processing of the AMDs

170 | The following AMD were prepared for testing: Mepilex[®] Ag (Mölnlycke Healthcare), Aquacel[®] Ag,
171 | Aquacel[®] Ag Foam, Aquacel[®] Ag Burn (all Convatec), UrgoTul[®] Silver (Urgo Medical), Acticoat (Smith &
172 | Nephew), PolyMem Silver[®] (Ferris MFG. Corp.), Inadine[®] (Systagenix), L-Mesitran[®] Net, L-Mesitran[®]
173 | Hydro (both from L-Mesitran Wound Care), and Bactigras (Smith & Nephew). This involved carefully

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

174 cutting the sterile dressing into a number of 1cm² pieces (so that there was sufficient for 1 piece per
175 test well) using a sterile scalpel or a pair of flame sterilised scissors. The nAMD; UrgoTul[®] (Urgo
176 Medical), and PolyMem[®] (Ferris MFG. Corp.), were prepared in the same way.

177 Details of these dressings (and references to published work) are in Table II.

178

179 **2.2 Impact of the AMD and AA on biofilm formation**

180 The ability of the range of AMD and AA to prevent biofilm formation was assessed using a crystal
181 violet biofilm formation assay as described by Baugh *et al* [34].

182 Overnight cultures of the test strains (grown in 5ml of Lysogeny (LB) broth [Oxoid]) were diluted in
183 fresh antibiotic-free Muller-Hinton (MH) broth [Oxoid] to an optical density at 600nm (OD₆₀₀) of 0.1,
184 and then 1ml was seeded into wells of a 24-well MTT [Corning, New York], alongside 1ml of either
185 diluted AA (water as diluent) or sterile water. AA was tested at the following dilutions: 5%, 2.5%,
186 1.25%, 0.63%, 0.31%, 0.16%, 0.08%, 0.04%, 0.02% and 0.01%. For the AMD test wells, one piece of
187 dressing was placed into the well containing the organism suspension and water to provide a total
188 volume of 2mls plus dressing.

189 Suitable controls were included in each assay, comprising 1ml overnight bacterial culture with 1ml
190 water (for the positive control), or 2mls MH broth with no bacteria (for the negative control).

191 Plates were sealed and statically incubated at (33°C); the temperature of the surface of a wound
192 [35]. After 72 hours, the liquid and AMD pieces were removed from the wells and the plates rinsed
193 in tap water to remove any unbound cells. Any existing biofilms were then visualised through
194 staining with 2mls of 1% crystal violet (CV) [Sigma Aldrich, Poole, UK], further rinsed (as above) to
195 remove unbound CV, and dye solubilised by the addition of 2mls of 70% ethanol. 200ul from each
196 well was then transferred into wells of a 96-well microtitre tray, and the OD₆₀₀ of the solubilised CV

197 solution was then measured using a FLUOstar Optima [BMG Labtech] to assess the biomass of the
198 biofilms.

199 The positive and negative controls for each test plate were examined and if within a normal range
200 the rest of the data was analysed for percentage change in biofilm biomass, and for statistical
201 significance, by comparing values for each AMD, and at each concentration of AA to untreated
202 (positive) controls using the ~~students' 't' test~~Students' 't' test. Adjustments for multiple
203 comparisons were made to control the family-wise error rate for each of the four groups of tests
204 using Holm's method [36].

206 3 RESULTS

207 All four of the bacterial isolates (PS_PA01, PS_1586, ACI_AYE and ACI_721) were tested against all
208 the AMD, nAMD and AA achieving at least four, but up to ten technical replicates. The
209 ~~number~~numbers of replicates ~~can be seen in parenthesis in table~~are shown on tables III- and IV for *P.*
210 *aeruginosa*, and *A. baumannii*, respectively.

211 The mean average optical densities of the solubilised CV were plotted per species for *A. baumannii*,
212 and *P. aeruginosa*, and are shown in figures 1 and 2, respectively for the dressings, and figures 3 and
213 4 for the AA and best/worst performing dressings against each species, respectively. The standard
214 error bars (denoting variation in the number of technical replicates) are also plotted and all data has
215 been normalised by subtraction of the negative (broth only) control.

216 The graphs demonstrate that there is a large variation in the test agents (AMD, nAMD and AA) in
217 terms of reducing biofilm formation (e.g. from an increase of 33% with L-Mesitran[®] Net to a decrease
218 of 100% with Acticoat and Mepilex[®] Ag for ACI_721). This is seen ~~both with~~between different
219 dressings that contain the same active agent (e.g silver) (e.g. from an increase of 43% with PolyMem
220 Silver[®] to a decrease of 100% with Acticoat and Mepilex[®] Ag for PS_PA01) and between those that

Formatted: Font color: Auto

contain ~~a variety of other~~different AM agents. This data is also shown in table III which provides percentage differences in biofilm biomass, and statistical significance ($p \leq 0.05$) when the difference in biofilm biomass for each dressing/agent was compared to the positive control. The p-values in tables III and IV are adjusted for multiple comparisons to control the error rate.

Generally all AMD showed similar activity against both representatives of each species.

3.1 Performance of the silver-containing AMD

Seven silver-containing AMDs were tested and the majority showed some effectiveness at reducing biofilm formation (~~table~~tables III & IV, figures 1 & 2). For both species and all four isolates, Mepilex[®] Ag (Mölnlycke Healthcare), and Acticoat (Smith & Nephew) were highly effective, leading to 90-100% reduction of biofilm formation compared to the positive control. These results were highly consistent across all replicates as shown by the small error bars, and were also statistically significant in the t-tests with all p-values ≤ 0.05 .

For the Aquacel[®] dressings (Ag, Ag foam and Ag burn), the reductions were generally modest, averaging 44% for PS_PA01 and 34% for PS_1586. The *A. baumannii* isolates appear to be more susceptible to these dressings with average reductions of 77% for ACI_721, and 65% for ACI_AYE. The results for Aquacel[®] Ag burn against biofilms of ACI_AYE show reductions of 94% (statistically significant with adjusted p-values < 0.05), and small standard error across all six replicates.

In general UrgoTul[®] Silver (a thin mesh-like AMD) was able to reduce biofilm formation for the majority of the isolates and replicates. However, for PS_1586, for four of the eight replicates, there was an increase in biofilm biomass in wells containing the dressings. This ranged from 13-80% (data not shown). PolyMem Silver[®] also gave varied results, with reductions in biomass of biofilms apparent with the *A. baumannii* isolates (61% reduction for ACI_AYE and 75% for ACI_721), but increases noted with both the *P. aeruginosa* isolates (43% increase in biofilm biomass for PS_PA01, and 11% increase for PS_1586).

245

246 3.2 Performance of the non-silver containing AMD

247 The four non-silver containing AMD gave varied results. Inadine® (Systagenix), which contains
248 povidone-iodine as the active agent, slightly reduced biofilm formation for the two clinical isolates
249 (ACI_721 and PS_1586 and ACI_721) by 6 and 10% respectively, but this was not statistically
250 significant, and the dressing was ineffective against the control strains.

251 The honey-containing dressings of L-Mesitran® Net and L-Mesitran® Hydro (both from L-Mesitran
252 Wound Care) were generally ineffective at preventing biofilm formation. Although reduced biofilm
253 formation occurred with *A. baumannii* ACI_AYE for both dressings with a maximum reduction of
254 10.4% (not statistically significant, p values >0.05), and ACI_721 (where there was a statistically
255 significant reduction (adjusted p = 0.004038) of 62% in biofilm biomass with L-Mesitran® Hydro
256 compared to the positive control), both dressings were ineffective at preventing biofilm formation of
257 *P. aeruginosa*. For both isolates increased biofilm formation occurred, ranging from 20% with L-
258 Mesitran® Net and PA_1586 to 200% with L-Mesitran® Hydro and this same isolate. L-Mesitran®
259 Hydro was the worst performer, with an average 115% increase in biofilm biomass for PS_PA01, and
260 average 200% increase for PS_1586 (Table III).

261 Bactigras (the only chlorhexidine-containing dressing) generally reduced biofilm formation, with
262 ~~statistically significant~~ reductions of 39, 59 and 68% for PS_PA01, ACI_AYE and ACI_721,
263 respectively- (with this latter reduction statistically significant with an adjusted p-value of 0.038). It
264 was however ineffective for PS_1586, where there was an average 200% increase in biofilm biomass.

265

266 3.3 Performance of the AMD vs the nAMD

267 Despite not containing an AM agent, both of the nAMD reduced biofilm formation in this experiment
268 for the *P. aeruginosa* (PS_1586), and *A. baumannii* (ACI_AYE and ACI_721) isolates. Reductions

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

269 ranged from 7% to 74%, ~~but~~ were ~~generally only~~ statistically significant ~~for ACI_721, where the 74%~~
270 ~~reduction is associated with an adjusted p-value of 0.003 (table III) and IV). Some of the reductions~~
271 were higher than those seen with some of the marketed AMDs. For example for ACI_ ~~AYE721,~~
272 Inadine[®], L-Mesitran[®] Net and L-Mesitran[®] Hydro resulted in differences of ~~+3, -10.4, -6, +33,~~ and -
273 ~~462%~~, compared to the nAMD (PolyMem[®] plain) where there was a ~~66~~74% reduction in biofilm
274 biomass (statistically significant, p=0.003).

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

275 For PS_PA01, there was no reduction in biofilm biomass with the nAMD (table III).

276  **3.4 Performance of the AMD compared to AA**

Formatted: Font color: Auto

277 **3.4 Performance of the AMD compared to AA**

278 The shaded cells in ~~table~~tables III and IV highlight the data where there was reduction in biofilm
279 formation by at least 90%. Acetic acid performs well as an anti-biofilming agent, with reductions of
280 ≥90% seen for concentrations of AA from 5% down to 0.16% (0.08% for ACI_721). This result was
281 consistent across all replicates.

282 Graphs 3 and 4 show the optical density of the biofilm biomass produced following incubation of the
283 cultures with the various concentrations of AA alongside the most and least effective of the AMDs
284 (Acticoat and L-Mesitran[®] Net for *A. baumannii*, and Mepilex[®] Ag and L-Mesitran[®] Hydro for *P.*
285 *aeruginosa*).

286 The data demonstrate that AA out performs the L-Mesitran[®] dressings in terms of reducing biofilm
287 formation, and compares favourably to the best-performing AMD (Acticoat and Mepilex[®] Ag).

288 **4 DISCUSSION**

289 Medicated AMDs have the potential to significantly reduce bacterial contamination of burns and
290 wounds; a post-insult complication that may delay wound healing, and lead to widespread systemic
291 infection [3637]. Despite being a small study, this work has demonstrated that in the *in vitro* setting

292 there is a large variation in the ability of commercial AMD to prevent biofilm formation of two key
293 burn wound pathogens. Biofilm formation is a key contributor to wound colonisation and
294 subsequent infection.

295 Although not concerning biofilms, Cavanagh *et al* [11] found similar results when they tested the
296 antimicrobial efficacy of a range of silver dressings (Mepilex® Ag, Algicell™ Ag, PolyMem Silver®,
297 Biostep™ Ag, and Acticoat) against planktonic forms of growth. In a log-reduction assay (from
298 Gallant-Behm *et al* [37,38]), they determined the ability of commercial silver AMD to kill
299 *Staphylococcus aureus* in 30 minutes. They noted a large variation in average log reduction between
300 the silver dressings and concluded that Acticoat was the only bactericidal dressing.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

301 Here we show that the silver dressings were the most effective at preventing biofilm formation, with
302 Mepilex® Ag and Acticoat consistently outperforming the other AMD and reducing biofilm formation
303 by at least 90%. A review of the literature shows that many comparisons of silver dressings have
304 drawn similar conclusions regarding efficacy of Acticoat. For example Gallant-Behm *et al* [37,38]
305 found that Acticoat was the only bactericidal dressing of eight that were tested.

306 Lesser reductions in biofilm formation were seen with the other silver-containing AMD, although
307 the results were still mostly statistically significant when compared to the positive control. The worst
308 performing AMDs were the honey-containing dressings, where there was little, if any, observable
309 benefit over the two nAMD. Additionally, the study has provided further evidence that AA can
310 prevent the formation of biofilms by key burn wound pathogens, and has indicated that this activity
311 compares favourably to the best performing AMDs. The antimicrobial effect of AA against planktonic
312 and biofilm growth modes of bacteria has been reported previously [38,39,40], but comparison to
313 AMD is a new finding.

314 ~~To further build up this evidence base~~In future, it would be useful to perform a number of well
315 controlled studies that take into consideration the exact dressing volume and quantities of AM agent

316 that are released. In this study dressings were measured using a ruler and cut to 1cm², but their
317 volumes were not considered. A number of the dressings are thick foam (Mepilex[®] Ag, Aquacel[®] Ag
318 Foam, PolyMem Silver[®] and PolyMem[®]), and hence the tested volume of these dressings would have
319 been considerably more than that of the thinner dressings (the remainder of the panel). Additionally
320 the dressings were used in the experiment as they would have been in the clinical setting and
321 therefore, no allowance was made for the quantity of the AM agent released from the dressings, nor
322 the site or mode of release. Cavanagh et al [11] performed a silver-dissolution assay and report the
323 24-hour silver release for Mepilex[®] Ag and Acticoat as 0.698 and 0.144 mg/cm², respectively,
324 compared to 0.00014 mg/cm² for PolyMem Silver[®]. Our findings suggest that the amount of
325 released silver could be an important determinant of anti-biofilming activity and therefore future
326 studies should be done to measure the silver release from the dressings throughout the course of
327 the 72 hour experiment.

328
329 Although an *in vitro* experiment is unlikely to mimic biofilm formation in the *in vivo* setting, the
330 experimental model used was most appropriate for testing the dressings based on the release of the
331 active antimicrobial agent into 'exudate'. Additional experiments should be performed to assess
332 antibiofilm properties of dressings that rely on contact with a solid surface for release of the
333 antimicrobial agent, and should also test a larger panel of Gram-negative organisms as well as some
334 Gram-positives organisms such as *S. aureus* and *Enterococcus* spp. Furthermore, experiments should
335 also be conducted on pre-formed biofilms to test efficacy of the AMD and AA against established
336 bacterial colonisation of burn wounds.

337
338 It should be remembered that there are many factors that govern the choice of dressing, and indeed
339 the choice of AMD. Although important, bacterial load reductions are only one aspect of wound
340 healing, and therefore despite showing that certain dressings are better than others for bacterial
341 reduction, this is only one consideration for a clinician choosing a dressing.

342

343 5 CONCLUSIONS

344 The NHS spends a large amount of an ever-pressured budget on commercial AMD, and especially
345 those that contain silver. This is despite a range of publications and systematic reviews concluding
346 that there is no robust evidence that dressings containing AM agents (silver, iodine or honey) are
347 more effective than unmedicated dressings for the prevention or treatment of wound infection [10].

348 This work has shown that there is a ~~vast~~large variation in the ability of commercial AMD to prevent
349 biofilm formation and therefore colonisation of wounds, and that a number of the AMD are not able
350 to prevent biofilm formation and are no better than the nAMD. We have also shown that AA
351 consistently prevents biofilm formation for all isolates with low error bars and lower cost than the
352 AMD (data not included).

353 Given their classification as medical devices, and the subsequent paucity of reliable and unbiased
354 data on their effectiveness, a standardised *in vitro* methodology should be developed in order for
355 external parties to examine and compare the efficacies of the commercial AMDs, along with robust
356 clinical randomised controlled trials. These are essential for informed clinical decision-making and
357 optimal patient management.

358

359 Clinicians should be wary of the use of AMDs (if intended to prevent or treat infections) in the
360 absence of data showing anti-biofilm efficacy, since the longer a biofilm is present, the greater
361 potential there is for systemic infection to occur.

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370 **6 Acknowledgements**

371 This work was supported by the NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Centre,
372 the Institute of Microbiology at the University of Birmingham, Aston University (M.R and RB both
373 students on secondment during the project), and the Healing Foundation Burns Research Centre.

374

375 **7 Transparency declarations**

376 None to declare.

377

378 **8 Disclaimer**

379 "This paper presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health research
380 (NIHR) and the Healing Foundation Burns Research Centre. The views expressed are those of the
381 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health or the Healing
382 Foundation."

383

Formatted: Font color: Auto

9 References

- [1] Church D, Elsayed S, Reid O, *et al.* Burn wound infections. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews* 2006; 19: 403-434.
- [2] Guggenheim M, Thurnheer T, Gmur R *et al.* Validation of the Zurich burn-biofilm model. *Burns* 2011; 37(7): 1125-33.
- [3] Hajska M, Slobodnikova L, Hupkova H, Koller J. In vitro efficacy of various topical antimicrobial agents in different time periods from contamination to application against 6 multidrug-resistant bacterial strains isolated from burn patients. *Burns* 2014; 40: 713-718.
- [4] Ryssel H, Kloeters O, Germann G, Schafer Th, Wiedemann G, Oehlbauer M. The antimicrobial effect of acetic acid – An alternative to common local antiseptics? *Burns* 2009; 35: 695-700.
- [5] Fu Y, Xie B, Ben D, *et al.* Pathogenic alteration in severe burn wounds. *Burns* 2012; 38 (1): 90-4.
- [6] Guggenheim M, Zbinden R, Handschin AE, *et al.* Changes in bacterial isolates from burn wounds and their antibiograms: a 20-year study (1986-2005). *Burns* 2009; 35(4): 553-60.
- [7] McManus AT, Mason AD, McManus MF *et al.* Twenty-five year review of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* bacteraemia in a burn center. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 1985; 4(2): 219-223.
- [8] Lawrence JC. The bacteriology of burns. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 1985; 6 Suppl B: 3-17.
- [9] Yali G, Jing C, Chunjiang L. Comparison of pathogens and antibiotic resistance of burn patients in the burn ICU or in the common burn ward. *Burns* 2014; 40(3): 402-7.
- [10] Anon. Silver dressings – do they work? *Drug Ther Bull* 2010; 48: 38–42.
- [11] Cavanagh MH, Burrell RE, Nadworny PL. Evaluating antimicrobial efficacy of new commercially available silver dressings. *International Wound Journal* 2010; 7: 394-405.
- [12] Percival SL, Hill KE, Malic S *et al.* Antimicrobial tolerance and the significance of persister cells in recalcitrant chronic wound biofilms. *Wound Repair Regen* 2011; 19: 1-9.
- [13] Stone HH. Review of *Pseudomonas sepsis* in thermal burns. *Annals of Surgery* 1966; 163: 297-305.

410 [14] Prescription Services. NHS Business Service Authority. Personal Communication. April 2010.

411 [15] Caruso DM, Foster KN, Hermans MH *et al.* Aquacel Ag in the management of partial-thickness
 412 burns: results of a clinical trial. *J Burn Care Rehabil* 2004; 25: 89-97.

413 [16] Khundkar R, Malic C, Burge T. Use of Acticoat™ dressings in burns: What is the evidence? *Burns*
 414 2010; 36: 751-758.

415 [17] Miraftab M, Masood, R, Edward-Jones V. A new carbohydrate-based wound dressing fibre with
 416 superior absorption and antimicrobial potency. *Carbohydr. Polym* 2014; 101: 1184-1190.

417 [18] Lara HH, Ayala-Nunez NV, Ixtapan-Turrent L *et al.* Mode of antiviral action of silver
 418 nanoparticles against HIV-1. *Journal of Nanotechnology* 2010; 8: 1.

419 [19] Bowler PG, Jones SA, Walker M *et al.* Microbial properties of a silver-containing Hydrofiber®
 420 dressing against a variety of burn wound pathogens. *J Burn Care Rehabil* 2005; 25: 192-196.

421 [20] Polak F, Clift M, Bower L, et al. Buyer's guide: Advanced wound dressings. CEP08038. Centre for
 422 Evidence-based Purchasing, London. October 2008

423 [21] Atiyeh B, Costagliola M, Hayek S *et al.* Effect of silver on burn wound infection control and
 424 healing: review of the literature. *Burns* 2007; 33: 139-48.

425 [22] Fong J. The use of silver products in the management of burn wounds: change in practice for the
 426 burn unit at Royal Perth Hospital. *Prim Intention* 2005; 13: S16-22.

427 [23] Fong J, Wood F. Nanocrystalline silver dressings in wound management. *Int J Nanomed* 2006; 1:
 428 441-9.

429 [24] Collier M. Silver dressings: more evidence is needed to support their widespread clinical use. *J*
 430 *Wound Care* 2009; 18: 77-8.

431 [25] Aziz Z, Abu SF, Chong NJ. A systematic review of silver-containing dressings and topical silver
 432 agents (used with dressings) for burn wounds. *Burns* 2012; 307-318.

433 [26] MeReC bulletin Vol.21, No.01. June 2010. 'Evidence-based prescribing of advanced wound
 434 dressings for chronic wounds in primary care'. Accessed from:

435 [http://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20140627113109/http://www.npc.nhs.uk/merec/](http://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20140627113109/http://www.npc.nhs.uk/merec/therap/wound/merec_bulletin_vol21_no1.php)
436 [therap/wound/merec_bulletin_vol21_no1.php](http://www.webarchive.org.uk/wayback/archive/20140627113109/http://www.npc.nhs.uk/merec/therap/wound/merec_bulletin_vol21_no1.php) [26.01.2015]

437 **[27]** Cutting K, White R, Edmonds M. The safety and efficacy of dressings with silver — addressing
438 clinical concerns. *Int Wound J* 2007; 4:177–84.

439 **[28]** Bradshaw CE. An in vitro comparison of the antimicrobial activity of honey, iodine and silver
440 wound dressings. *Bioscience Horizons* 2011; 4(1): 61-70.

441 **[29]** Alam F, Islam MA, Gan SH *et al*. Honey: A Potential Therapeutic Agent for Managing Diabetic
442 Wounds. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine* 2014; Article ID 169130.

443 **[30]** Hugo WB, Longworth AR. Some aspects of the mode of action of chlorhexidine. *J Pharm*
444 *Pharmacol* 1964; 16: 655–62.

445 **[31]** Smith DT. Causes and treatments of otitis media; I. Observations on 205 cases occurring in 613
446 consecutive hospital admissions. *JAMA Paediatrics* 1924; 28: 1.

447 **[32]** Currence, WW. Acetic acid aerosol in treatment of purulent bronchiectasis due to *Pseudomonas*
448 *aeruginosa*. *JAMA Paediatrics* 1952; 83(5): 637-641.

449 **[33]** Kass EH, Sossens, HS. Prevention of infection of urinary tract in presence of indwelling
450 catheters; description of electromechanical valve to provide intermittent drainage of the bladder.
451 *JAMA* 1959; 169 (11): 1181-3.

452 **[34]** Baugh S, Ekanayaka AS, Piddock LJV, Webber MA. Loss of or inhibition of all multidrug
453 resistance efflux pumps of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium results in impaired ability to
454 form a biofilm. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2012; 67: 2409-2417.

455 **[35]** McGuinness W, Vella E, Harrison D. Influence of dressing changes on wound temperature.
456 *Journal of Wound Care* 2004; 13 (9): 383-385.

457 **[36]** Holm, S. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of*
458 *Statistics* 1979; 6: 65–70.

Formatted: Font: Bold, English (U.K.)

460 | **[37]** Landis SJ. Chronic wound infection and antimicrobial use. *Adv Skin Wound Care* 2008; 21: 531-
461 | 540.

462 | **[3738]** Gallant-Behm CL, Yin HQ, Liu SJ *et al.* Comparison of *in vitro* disc diffusion and time kill-kinetic
463 | assays for the evaluation of antimicrobial wound dressing efficacy. *Wound Rep Reg* 2005; 13: 412-
464 | 21.

465 | **[3839]** Fraise AP, Wilkinson MAC, Bradley CR, Oppenheim B, Moiemmen N. The antibacterial activity
466 | and stability of acetic acid. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2013; 84(4): 329-331.

467 | **[3940]** Bjarnsholt T, Alhede M, Jensen PØ, Nielsen AK, Johansen HK, Homøe P *et al.* Antibiofilm
468 | properties of acetic acid. *Advances in Wound Care* 2014; 1-9

469 | **[4041]** Mepilex Ag (homepage on the Internet). Sweden: Molnycke HealthCare LLC; ©2009. Mepilex
470 | Ag: the effective antimicrobial absorbent foam dressing; 2 pages. URL
471 | <http://www.molnycke.com/Files/Wound-Care/Productsheets/MepilexAg-PS.pdf> [accessed
472 | 26.01.2015]

473 | **[4142]** Aquacel Ag Leaflet: 'Micro-contouring, bacteria killing, not all silver dressings are created
474 | equal. ConvaTec. URL [http://www.convatec.co.uk/media/297385/
475 | 10711_aq_ag_detail_aid_8pp_master_\(uk\)_single_pages_19may2010.pdf](http://www.convatec.co.uk/media/297385/10711_aq_ag_detail_aid_8pp_master_(uk)_single_pages_19may2010.pdf) [accessed 26.01.2015]

476 | **[4243]** Acticoat™ product range (homepage on the Internet). Largo, FL, USA: Smith and Nephew,
477 | Inc.; ©2008. Acticoat™ product information. URL [http://www.smith-nephew.com/key-
478 | products/advanced-wound-management/acticoat/](http://www.smith-nephew.com/key-products/advanced-wound-management/acticoat/) [accessed 26.01.2015]

479 | **[4344]** Inadine Leaflet: 'Inadine® super reliable, super efficient, and less dramatic at change time'.
480 | Systagenix. URL http://www.southwesthealthline.ca/healthlibrary_docs/H.4.01607.pdf [accessed
481 | 26.01.2015].

482 | **[4445]** L-Mesitran Leaflet: 'Life is sweeter with L-Mesitran®'. Aspen Medical. URL
483 | [http://www.aspenmedicaleurope.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/L-Mesitran-Life-is-Sweeter-A5-
484 | Brochure-355L2-08.14-XS414.pdf](http://www.aspenmedicaleurope.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/L-Mesitran-Life-is-Sweeter-A5-Brochure-355L2-08.14-XS414.pdf) [accessed 26.01.2015].

485 | **[4546]** Bactigras product range (homepage on the Internet). Smith and Nephew, Inc. Bactigras
486 | product information. URL <http://www.smith-nephew.com/south-africa/what-we-do/advanced->
487 | [wound-management2/products/by-product-type/low-adherent-dressings/bactigras-/](http://www.smith-nephew.com/south-africa/what-we-do/advanced-wound-management2/products/by-product-type/low-adherent-dressings/bactigras/) [accessed
488 | 26.01.2015].
489 |

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, English
(U.S.)

490 **Table I:** List of the control and clinical isolates used in this study

Study Identifier	Organism	Description
PS_PA01	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	Control strain [ATCC_15692]. Originally isolated from an infected wound.
PS_1586	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	QEHF Clinical burn wound isolate.
ACI_AYE	<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	Control strain [ATCC® BAA-1710]. Originally isolated from human blood.
ACI_721	<i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i>	QEHF Clinical burn wound isolate.

Formatted: Position: Vertical: 4.34 cm, Relative to: Page

Formatted Table

Formatted: Position: Vertical: 4.34 cm, Relative to: Page

Formatted: Position: Vertical: 4.34 cm, Relative to: Page

Formatted: Position: Vertical: 4.34 cm, Relative to: Page

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Position: Vertical: 4.34 cm, Relative to: Page

491

492

Table II: List of the dressings/agents used in this study alongside their supplier, antimicrobial agent and formulation, and reports/references on their activity

Dressing [Agent]	Supplier	Antimicrobial agent and formulation	Reports/References
Mepilex® Ag [Silver]	Mölnlycke Healthcare	Silver sulphate (Ag ₂ SO ₄) dressing. Thick, soft silicone foam dressing	Dressing inactivates a wide range of bacteria within 30 minutes, provides a rapid and sustained silver release, can be worn for 7 days and does not stain [4041]
Aquacel® Ag [Silver]	Convatec	Ionic silver impregnated hydrofibre pad composed of sodium carboxymethylcellulose and 1.2% ionic silver	AQUACEL® Ag Foam dressings contain ionic silver to kill a wide variety of micro-organisms, (including certain tested antibiotic-resistant bacteria) within 30 minutes, and provide sustained bacterial killing for up to seven days. [41][42]
Aquacel® Ag Foam [Silver]	Convatec	As above	As above
Aquacel® Ag Burn [Silver]	Convatec	As above	As above
UrgoTul® Silver [Silver]	Urgo Medical	Hydrocolloid dressing consisting of a polyester web, impregnated with carboxylmethyl cellulose, Vaseline and silver.	Many reports [See JWC educational supplement]. An example is 102 patients with critically colonised venous leg ulcers who were treated with Urgotul Silver versus plain Urgotul. After 8 weeks, there was a significantly greater reduction in wound size in the Urgotul Silver group (p=0.002) as well as fewer clinical signs of critical colonisation (p<0.001).
Acticoat [Silver]	Smith & Nephew	Nanocrystalline silver impregnated pad consisting of three layers	Dressing kills bacteria <i>in vitro</i> in 30 minutes, acts as an antibacterial barrier for up to 3 days, provides sustained silver release, and is effective against over 150 microorganisms (Gram-positive, Gram-negative, yeasts and molds) [4243].
PolyMem Silver® [Silver]	Ferris MFG. Corp.	Polyurethane membrane matrix containing F68 surfactant, glycerol, a starch copolymer and silver.	
Inadine® [Iodine]	Systagenix	Low adherent knitted viscose fabric impregnated with a polyethylene glycol (PEG) base containing 10% povidone iodine (combination of polyvinylpyrrolidone and elemental iodine).	Broad spectrum of activity against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, anaerobes, yeast, fungi and spores [4344].

Dressing [Agent]	Supplier	Antimicrobial agent and formulation	Reports/References
L-Mesitran® Net [Honey]	L-Mesitran Wound Care	Non-adherent open polyester mesh coated with a thin layer of L-Mesitran® Hydro gel.	L-Mesitran is a broad-spectrumantimicrobialspectrum antimicrobial, effective against most bacteria including MRSA and VRE [4445]
L-Mesitran® Hydro [Honey]	L-Mesitran Wound Care	Hydrogel sheet (1mm thick) attached to a semi polyurethane membrane by a thin fibrous bonding layer. The hydrogel contains 30% of medical grade honey.	As above
Bactigras [Chlorhexidine]	Smith & Nephew	Chlorhexidine Acetate BP 0.5% in white soft paraffin BP.	Bacteriostatic and bactericidal. Chlorhexidine acetate has been shown to be active, in vitro, against a wide range of Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria at concentrations of 10-50 µg/ml. These include: Streptococcus pyogenes, Enterococcus faecalis, Corynebacterium diphtheriae, <i>Strep. pneumoniae</i> , <i>S. aureus</i> , <i>Proteus vulgaris</i> , <i>E. coli</i> , and <i>P. aeruginosa</i> [4546]
UrgoTul® plain [No AM agent]	Urgo Medical	n/a	n/a
PolyMem® plain [No AM agent]	Ferris MFG. Corp.	n/a	n/a
Acetic acid (5% stock)	Tayside Pharmaceuticals	Acetic acid (CH ₃ COOH)	Bactericidal and active against biofilms when used at low concentration for a range of important burn wound pathogens [38,39,40].

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Table III: Table showing the percentage (%) change in biofilm biomass for each of the isolates when co-incubated with each of the AMD, nAMD or AA for 72 hours, when compared to an untreated, positive control.

Control		<i>P. aeruginosa</i>				<i>A. baumannii</i>				Significance			
Material	Δlog ₁₀ CFU	Replicates	p-value	p-value*	Significance	Material	Δlog ₁₀ CFU	Replicates	p-value	p-value*	Significance		
Mepilex® Ag	-100 (8)*	8	<0.001	0.001	Yes	Mepilex® Ag	-99.9 (6)*	95.9 (8)*	-100 (6)*	<0.001	0.001	Yes	
Aquacel® Ag	-49 (8)*	change = 0.001	replicates	p-value	p-value*	Aquacel® Ag	-35 (6)*	29 (8)*	-24 (6)*	p-value = 1	0.001	Significance	
Aquacel® Ag Foam	-21 (8)*	biomass	0.064	0.635		Aquacel® Ag Foam	-36 (6)*	-66 (8)*	-74 (6)*	0.005	0.078		
Aquacel® Ag Burn	-63 (6)*	6	0.020	0.219	=	Aquacel® Ag Burn	-31 (4)	-94 (6)*	-82 (4)*	0.601	1.000		
UrgoTul® Silver	-47 (10)*	10	0.002	0.029	Yes	UrgoTul® Silver	+16 (8)	-20 (10)	-4 (8)	0.457	1.000		
Acticoat	-100 (8)*	8	<0.001	0.001	Yes	Acticoat	-94 (6)*	-96 (8)*	-100 (6)*	<0.001	0.005	Yes	
PolyMem Silver®	+43 (8)	8	0.432	1.000	=	PolyMem Silver®	+11 (6)	-61 (8)*	-75 (6)*	0.521	1.000		
Inadine®	+3 (8)	8	0.488	1.000	=	Inadine®	-10 (6)	+3 (8)	-6 (6)	0.609	1.000		
L-Mesitran® Net	+38 (6)	6	0.808	1.000	=	L-Mesitran® Net	+20 (4)	-10.4 (6)	+33 (4) 0.5	1.000			
L-Mesitran® Hydro	+115 (8)	8	0.148	1.000	=	L-Mesitran® Hydro	+200 (6)	6	0.316	-1 (8) 0.00	-62 (8) 0.00		
Bactigras	-39 (8)*	8	0.005	0.070	=	Bactigras	+200 (6)	-59 (8)* 6	-68 (6)*	1.000			
UrgoTul® plain	+56 (4)	4	0.139	1.000	=	UrgoTul® plain	-17 (4)*	-7 (6)	-27 (4)	0.051	0.660		
PolyMem®	+39 (6)	6	0.665	1.000	=	PolyMem®	-27 (4)*	-66 (6)*	-74	0.055	0.660	29	

- [illegible]

	plain					
Acetic acid biofilm control	Acetic acid 2.5%	-90 (8)*	-91 (8)*	-93 (10)*	-92 (8)*	
	Acetic acid 1.25%	-94 (8)*	-90 (8)*	-93 (10)*	-93 (8)*	
	Acetic acid 0.63%	-94 (8)*	-94 (8)*	-93 (10)*	-96 (8)*	
	Acetic acid 0.31%	-95 (8)*	-97 (8)*	-93 (10)*	-96 (8)*	
	Acetic acid 0.16%	-96 (8)*	-86 (8)*	-90 (10)*	-94 (8)*	
	Acetic acid 0.08%	-64 (8)*	-23 (8)*	-28 (10)	-95 (8)*	
	Acetic acid 0.04%	+35 (8)	+5 (8)	+10 (10)	+5 (8)	501
	Acetic acid 0.02%	+42 (8)	-7 (8)	+6 (10)	+13 (8)	
	Acetic acid 0.01%	+67 (6)	+11 (4)	-30 (4)	+7 (4)	

Table III footnote: + and — refer to increases and decreases in biomass, respectively, with the number of replicates shown in parenthesis. Asterisks (*) denote statistically significant changes in biomass (when compared to the positive control), and shaded cells

Formatted: Left, Position: Horizontal: Center, Relative to: Margin, Vertical: 3.71 cm, Relative to: Page

Deleted Cells
Deleted Cells
Deleted Cells

Table III: Table showing the percentage (%) change in biofilm biomass for each of the *Pseudomonas* nAMD or AA for 72 hours, when compared to an untreated, positive control.

502

<u>Dressing/agent</u>	<u><i>P. aeruginosa</i> PA01</u>						<u><i>P. aeruginosa</i> PA 1586</u>					
	<u>Percentage change^Δ</u>	<u>Number of replicates</u>	<u>T-test p-value[^]</u>	<u>Adjusted p-value[*]</u>	<u>Adjusted significance[●]</u>		<u>Percentage change^Δ</u>	<u>Number of replicates</u>	<u>T-test p-value[^]</u>	<u>Adjusted p-value[*]</u>	<u>Adjusted significance[●]</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 5%</u>	<u>-86</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.003</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-88</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 2.5%</u>	<u>-90</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.002</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-91</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 1.25%</u>	<u>-94</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.002</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-90</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.63%</u>	<u>-94</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-94</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.31%</u>	<u>-95</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-97</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.16%</u>	<u>-96</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-86</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>0.011</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.08%</u>	<u>-64</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.006</u>	<u>0.074</u>	<u>-</u>		<u>-23</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.035</u>	<u>0.491</u>	<u>-</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.04%</u>	<u>+35</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.783</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>-</u>		<u>+5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.653</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>-</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.02%</u>	<u>+42</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.673</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>-</u>		<u>-7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.298</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>-</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.01%</u>	<u>+67</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.103</u>	<u>0.928</u>	<u>-</u>		<u>+11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0.589</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>-</u>	

503

504

505

Table IV: Table showing the percentage (%) change in biofilm biomass for each of the *Acinetobacter baumannii* isolates when coincubated with each of the AMD, nAMD or AA for 72 hours, when compared to an untreated, positive control.

Dressing/agent	<i>A. baumannii</i> AYE					<i>A. baumannii</i> ACL 721				
	Percentage change ^Δ	Number of replicates	T-test p-value ^Δ	Adjusted p-value*	Adjusted significance•	Percentage change ^Δ	Number of replicates	T-test p-value ^Δ	Adjusted p-value*	Adjusted significance•
<u>Mepilex[®] Ag</u>	<u>-95.9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>-100</u>	<u>6</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Aquacel[®] Ag</u>	<u>-39</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.150</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-74</u>	<u>6</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.006</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Aquacel[®] Ag Foam</u>	<u>-66</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.027</u>	<u>0.295</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-74</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>0.010</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Aquacel[®] Ag Burn</u>	<u>-94</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.002</u>	<u>0.031</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>-82</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0.003</u>	<u>0.032</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>UrgoTul[®] Silver</u>	<u>-20</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0.721</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.970</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>
<u>Acticoat</u>	<u>-96</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.002</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>-100</u>	<u>6</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>PolyMem Silver[®]</u>	<u>-61</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.007</u>	<u>0.090</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-75</u>	<u>6</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Inadine[®]</u>	<u>+3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.880</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-6</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.820</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>
<u>L-Mesitran[®] Net</u>	<u>-10.4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.469</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>+33</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0.055</u>	<u>0.385</u>	<u>:</u>
<u>L-Mesitran[®] Hydro</u>	<u>-1</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.926</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-62</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.004</u>	<u>0.038</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Bactigras</u>	<u>-59</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.012</u>	<u>0.148</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-68</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.004</u>	<u>0.038</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>UrgoTul[®] plain</u>	<u>-7</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.471</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-27</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0.068</u>	<u>0.405</u>	<u>:</u>
<u>PolyMem[®] plain</u>	<u>-66</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.004</u>	<u>0.054</u>	<u>:</u>	<u>-74</u>	<u>4</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.003</u>	<u>Yes</u>
Table legend: ^Δ where – refers to reduction in biofilm biomass, and + to increase in biofilm biomass ^Δ original p-values from the Student's T-test, * p-values adjusted for multiple comparisons using Holm's method, • column shows dressings with an adjusted p-value<0.05										

<u>Dressing/agent</u>	<u>A. baumannii AYE</u>						<u>A. baumannii ACI 721</u>					
	<u>Percentage change^Δ</u>	<u>Number of replicates</u>	<u>T-test p-value[^]</u>	<u>Adjusted p-value[*]</u>	<u>Adjusted significance[●]</u>		<u>Percentage change^Δ</u>	<u>Number of replicates</u>	<u>T-test p-value[^]</u>	<u>Adjusted p-value[*]</u>	<u>Adjusted significance[●]</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 5%</u>	<u>-92</u>	<u>10</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-90</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 2.5%</u>	<u>-93</u>	<u>10</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-92</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 1.25%</u>	<u>-93</u>	<u>10</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-93</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.63%</u>	<u>-93</u>	<u>10</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-96</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.31%</u>	<u>-93</u>	<u>10</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-96</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.16%</u>	<u>-90</u>	<u>10</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>		<u>-94</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.08%</u>	<u>-28</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0.273</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>		<u>-95</u>	<u>8</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u><0.001</u>	<u>Yes</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.04%</u>	<u>+10</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0.260</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>		<u>+5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.404</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.02%</u>	<u>+6</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>0.220</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>		<u>+13</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0.157</u>	<u>0.787</u>	<u>:</u>	
<u>Acetic acid 0.01%</u>	<u>-30</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0.838</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>		<u>+7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0.541</u>	<u>1.000</u>	<u>:</u>	

506

507

508

509

510 **Figure legends**

511 **Figure 1: Graph showing the mean average biomass of the biofilms produced by the *A. baumannii***
512 **isolates as measured through the crystal violet assay**

513 Optical density on the y axis refers to the average biofilm biomass for the *A. baumannii* isolates
514 when tested with the range of agents shown on the x axis. All the data has been normalised by
515 subtraction of the negative control and error bars (showing the standard error) have been provided.
516 Test agents have been grouped according to the active antimicrobial agent present.

517
518 **Figure 2: Graph showing the mean average biomass of the biofilms produced by the *P. aeruginosa***
519 **isolates as measured through the crystal violet assay**

520 Optical density on the y axis refers to the average biofilm biomass for the *P. aeruginosa* isolates
521 when tested with the range of agents shown on the x axis. All the data has been normalised by
522 subtraction of the negative control and error bars (showing the standard error) have been provided.
523 Test agents have been grouped according to the active antimicrobial agent present.

524
525 **Figure 3: Graph showing the mean average biomass of the biofilms produced by the *A. baumannii***
526 **isolates as measured through the crystal violet assay**

527 Optical density on the y axis refers to the average biofilm biomass for the *A. baumannii* isolates
528 when tested with the AA and the best/worst performing dressings shown on the x axis. All the data
529 has been normalised by subtraction of the negative control and error bars have been provided.

530

531

532

533 **Figure 4: Graph showing the mean average biomass of the biofilms produced by the *P. aeruginosa***
534 **isolates as measured through the crystal violet assay**
535 Optical density on the y axis refers to the average biofilm biomass for the *P. aeruginosa* isolates
536 when tested with the AA and the best/worst performing dressings shown on the x axis. All the data
537 has been normalised by subtraction of the negative control and error bars have been provided.
538